



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ancient book which came his way—whether an Italian, a Spanish, a German, or a Latin classic, his sole object in perusing it was to pick out from it the ideas which recommended themselves to his taste and judgment. In no single instance did he dream of making it the means of ascertaining far less of settling, the niceties of idiom or of grammar.”

In several numbers of *Notes and Queries*, cases of misquotation in Scott's works have been pointed out. In 4.5.577, “F” cites a case where a passage from the *Gospel of Saint Matthew* is quoted inaccurately in both *Waverley* and the *Abbot*, differing in each place. He gives other misquotations, from the *Merchant of Venice* in the *Abbot*, and from *Macbeth* in the *Monastery*. In 4.5.486, the same writer cites two cases from the *Bride of Lammermoor*, and says there are many others in his novels. In 4.6.200, J. S. Udall notes a misquotation from *Saint Matthew* in the *Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and J. H. J. Oakley in 4.10.184 gives three Latin passages misquoted in the *Antiquary*. The last named writer remarks:

“When the author of *Waverley* described the Baron of Bradwardine as ‘a scholar according to the scholarship of Scotchmen—that is, his learning was more diffuse than accurate, and he was rather a reader than a grammarian,’ he has given us a pretty true account of his own scholarship.”

An examination of other quotations in the *Antiquary* shows that several passages not hitherto remarked are also incorrect in detail. In quoting from *II Henry IV*, he has *fico* for *foutre*; five lines from *I Henry IV* are quoted correctly as a heading for Chapter XVI, but are given as from Part II. In Chapter III he quotes from *Hudibras*, and adds two lines which are not a part of the passage. Quotations from *King John*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and Wordsworth's *Fountain*, are also inaccurate. In *Woodstock*, elsewhere in the *Antiquary*, and in his review of Godwin's *Life of Chaucer*, quotations from Chaucer vary considerably from the standard editions.

Considering Scott's frequent allusions to Chaucer, he should have known the poet well. In the *Edinburgh Review* we find an extensive

review of *Godwin's Life of Chaucer*. His comparisons are mainly with Tyrwhitt's edition, which is also mentioned in his review of Ellis' *Specimens of the Early English Poets*. But Tyrwhitt does not reprint *The Flower and the Leaf*, and mentions it only to doubt its authenticity. Scott mentions Warton's *History of English Poetry*, but this does not contain the poem, though there is a discussion of it. In his edition of Dryden's works, he expresses his admiration for *The Flower and the Leaf*, especially of Dryden's modernization.

If Scott occasionally misquoted, from undue reliance on his memory, he is not alone in this respect among English writers; but such extensive variations from his original as are disclosed by the passage from the *Antiquary* are not a little surprising.

J. R. SCHULTZ.

Yale University.

ON THE TWO PLACE-NAMES IN “THANATOPSIS”

Take the wings

Of morning, pierce the Barcan wilderness,
Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
Save his own dashings—yet the dead are there.
William Cullen Bryant, “*Thanatopsis*.”

The Barcan wilderness and the Oregon are the only place-names used in the whole poem. Readers may have frequently asked themselves why just these particular places should have occurred to the poet's mind, when he wished to symbolize the whole world as a sepulcher of the dead.

The explanation is to be found in the current and local interest which two events had for the poet.

Bryant was born in Cummington in the northwestern part of Hampshire county, Mass., and was educated there and later at Williams College in the northwestern corner of Berkshire county. His chief reading, aside from his father's well-stocked library, was the *Hampshire Gazette*. His outlook on the world was

therefore much colored by Connecticut valley happenings.

In this same valley, in Hampden county, town of Brimfield, lived Gen. William Eaton. He had been a soldier with Mad Anthony Wayne in Ohio, and on resigning his military commission in 1798 was appointed Consul to Tunis. He was engaged there in difficult and tedious negotiations with the Bey, to prevent him from harassing unprotected American commerce in the Mediterranean. In June, 1803, he returned to the United States. As war had broken out with Tripoli because of piracy upon our commerce, Eaton was sent back June, 1804, as Naval Agent of the United States, accompanying our fleet of five vessels under command of Com. Barron. In the fall of 1805 Gen. Eaton landed in Alexandria. Here he learned that Hamet Pasha, the rightful sovereign of Tripoli, then deposed and in exile, was in upper Egypt. Wishing to get into communication with the Pasha, he proceeded with three men by Nile-boat to Cairo. Here he employed a skillful young fellow, a sort of Proteus, named Eugene Leitensdorfer, to bring Hamet to the American station. This man, accompanied by an attendant and two dromedaries, penetrated the desert, traveling night and day, feeding the animals balls of meal and eggs, reached safely the Mameluke camp, and brought the Pasha and 150 retainers back with him.

In March, 1805, Gen. Eaton started with his little army from Alexandria. It consisted of six private marines, twenty-five cannoneers, thirty-eight Greeks, and some Arab cavalry, besides the Pasha's party, in all about 400 men. The baggage was carried on 107 camels. This strange army was now to march into the interior and co-operate from the rear with the American fleet which was to attack from the front. With the greatest hardship, Eaton's motley company traversed the desert of Barca for 600 miles, facing the double danger of starvation and mutiny among such a mixed and undisciplined body of soldiery. They made the trip in nineteen days, in itself a remarkable feat, and helped the fleet as planned. On March 27 a two-hour battle against odds of ten to one ended in the capture of the city of Derne, and led soon after to a treaty with the thor-

oughly frightened reigning Pasha of Tripoli.

In November, 1805, Gen. Eaton returned to the United States, and was received with fêtes in his honor. The press was everywhere filled with laudatory notices of his Barcan enterprise and bravery. Massachusetts voted him a gift of 10,000 acres of land as a recognition of his services.

Bryant (b. 1794) was at that time an intelligent lad of eleven years enjoying the advantages of an unusual home. When we remember that Jefferson's "Embargo" in 1808 was the object of a lengthy satirical polemic in verse in the poet's fourteenth year, we should not be surprised at the lad's interest in national movements at so early an age. He was deeply impressed by the events themselves, and particularly by the local celebrations of that march through the desert of Barca.

The other allusion is possibly more familiar. The Oregon was the name first given to the Columbia river, whose mouth had been discovered and entered a few miles by Capt. Gray. After the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, President Jefferson dreamed of the possibility of ascending the newly-acquired Missouri river to its source, which might lie somewhere near the source of that other magnificent western river, whose greatness was apparent from its size and its current at the mouth. He secured a grant of funds for the expedition and sent his own private secretary, Capt. Lewis, as leader, to try to make the dream come true. The expedition was made in 1804-6. Several circumstances caused this event to take hold of the American imagination with great intensity; the magnitude and daring of the enterprise, its significance as a feature of American empire-building, its commercial importance in opening up a field for successful American rivalry with the British and Russians in the profitable fur trade with China, etc. When the details of the voyage became known, about 1807, the regions traversed stood out in the popular fancy as the "Great Lone Land," a place where the party had traveled four long months without seeing a single human being not of their own party.

Bryant, aged thirteen, must have been carried away like the rest of Americans with the re-

markable world-romance of the voyage and the new region.

Thanatopsis was written in 1811. It is no wonder then that Barca and Oregon became concrete symbols of East and West, and both of uninhabited wastes which death might be supposed to spare—but does not.

JOHN WILLIAM SCHOLL.

University of Michigan.

JOSEF SCHOCH: *Perfectum Historicum und Perfectum Praesens im Französischen von seinen Anfängen bis 1700*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1912. 8vo, xi + 92 pp. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, 4, and also separately as Tübingen dissertation.)

EDMUND STAACKE: *Die Verwendung von Plusqueparfait und Passé-Antérieur im Französischen*. Göttingen, 1912. 8vo., xiii + 117 pp. (Göttingen Dissertation.)

The author of the first of these two studies is inspired in method and subject by Herzog's treatment of the auxiliaries.¹ The first of the three chapters gives a careful and convenient survey of the past indefinite, showing by statistical data the progress made by the tense toward a fixed form until the 16th century, when the position of the participle became more uniform and the earlier freedom of agreement gave way to the present literary usage. Both of these phenomena, as noted by Herzog, are of value as showing definitely the meaning of the original speaker. However, as it is now assured that the forms of *avoir* and *être* were real auxiliaries by the 11th century, and as we already have general knowledge of the change in the 16th century, the light now thrown by Schoch's work is upon the process, and his results are corroborative rather than original. Since his

¹ Herzog, *Beiheft zur ZRPh*, XXVI, pp. 76-186. This influence may be seen, aside from direct references, pp. 3, 23, 25, in the general scheme of the first part which follows out a suggestion of Herzog, p. 165, note, and in the attention to differences of style in various genres stressed throughout; cf. o. c. p. 167 ff.

intention throughout is to show the decrease in any but the synthetic function, it would have been desirable to consider the construction based upon the Latin type: *liberos parentibus sublectos habebis*,² i. e., where the subject of the clause is different from that of the participle. This is continued in French,³ and the history of the construction would throw light upon our tense. It must be remembered, also, that the past indefinite cannot be said to have reached a fixed form even to-day, although this does not greatly affect its function.

The remainder of the book is occupied by a discussion of the use of the past definite and past indefinite. This theoretical portion may be disregarded. The author overlooks such nice distinctions of meaning as that formulated by Herzog,⁴ and studies the tenses from an objective standpoint. When, therefore, he finds the two tenses at times "in the same function" his results cannot be accepted. The examples themselves, which are in an accessible form, may be of value to investigators, and are good as showing variations of usage under parallel conditions in various authors.

Finally, the author decides that in the spoken language the past indefinite had not become an historical perfect by the 17th century. The further aspects of this problem are evidently to be discussed in a later work of which mention is made.⁶ It is to be hoped that here the subjective element will not be neglected. When the character of the past indefinite today, as a spoken, narrative tense, is defined, it will doubtless be found that the usage is more closely related to that of the Old French than would be gathered from Schoch's treatment.⁷

² Cf. Herzog, p. 112.

³ Cf. Commynes, p. 68; *Tout mors eurent les testes trencées*. Cf. also Lerch, *Prädikative Participle für Verbalsubstantiva*, ZRPh., Beiheft 42, p. 74.

⁴ Cf. o. c., p. 167 ff, § 119.

⁵ Cf. p. 24.

⁶ Cf. p. 44.

⁷ Cf. the usage in Old French with *autrefois*, Villeh., p. 72, § 130; Jehan Le Bel, p. 122, l. 6; Commynes, p. 176, l. 1; p. 267, l. 2-3; with *pieça*: Villeh., p. 108, § 188; Henri de Valenciennes, p. 370, § 608; with secondary, subordinate sequence: *ibid.*, p. 314, § 515; p. 390, § 644; p. 392, § 645.